

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants note that the remarks and amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals presented to the Examiner during the telephone call of October 24, 2007.

The Office Action mailed July 24, 2007 considered and rejected claims 1-37. Claims 1-8, 10-22, and 24-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lamb (6,892,264), hereinafter Lamb. Claims 9 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb in view of Kuik (7,165,258).

By this paper, claims 1-5, 14-18, 29-30, and 32 have been amended and no claims have been added or canceled, such that claims 1-37 remain pending, of which claims 1, 15, 29, and 32 are the only independent claims at issue.¹

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed to embodiments for providing clients access to devices through a network. Claim 1, for example recites a method wherein a set of one or more devices that can be accessed locally or over a network is identified. The identified set consists of only devices to which the client has been assigned. A target is generated that identifies the set of the one or more devices and the target includes at least one corresponding device identifier. Client authorization information is then associated with the target identifying the set of one or more devices. The target is then assigned to a port through a protocol-independent port driver at the network provider.

The remaining independent claims are closely related to claim 1. Claim 15 recites a computer program product corresponding to claim 1, while claim 29 recites limitation similar to claim 1, but replaces an act of assigning the target with a step for exposing the device to the client. Finally, claim 32 recites limitation similar to claim 1, except it is directed specifically to the iSCSI protocol. The distinctions presented with regard to claim 1 are contained within each of the independent claim and the arguments present with regard to claim 1 are therefore applicable to all of the independent claims.

The independent claims were rejected as being anticipated by a single reference, Lamb, which is directed to embodiments for an improved Storage Area Network. Lamb is even more specifically directed to plug-n-play storage device embodiments and the generation of a logical

¹ Support for the amendments is found throughout the Specification as originally written and more particularly on pgs. 5, 11, and 15 of the Application as originally filed.

identification for the device based on a detected event. The relevant passages describe a host being assigned a logical unit number by the manager during a plug and play situation.

While the cited art of Lamb discloses a traditional Storage Area Network, Lamb fails to fully teach the limitations present in the amended claims. For example, Lamb fails to teach or suggest, among other things, the use of "targets" in the manner described in the claims, which are directed to a set of devices based on a client identity and consisting of only devices assigned to a client. Instead, the cited art describes the general features of a Storage Area Network in which a manager assigns logical units to hosts. Lamb is generally not directed to controlling access to storage devices based on the client's identity. Instead, Lamb is directed to assigning storage devices to host computers, and the host computers would then typically control access by the clients. Lamb fails to describe how the hosts would control client access at all. In contrast, the present claims are directed to method for controlling the access of clients based on the client's identity.

Targets are used within the present embodiments to identify specific groups of devices that a client is assigned to. The devices can be real or virtual, and may consist of the partial use of a device. By using a target, the clients can be assigned and removed easily from the target to control access to all of the devices in the target. Additionally, devices can be easily added to the target allowing associated client's to access the device.

The presently cited art of Lamb does not disclose the use of targets as contemplated by the embodiments of the current claims. In Lamb, access to devices is based assigning an individual logical unit number to a host. The logical unit number does not accurately describe a target, because a target is a set of devices available to a client, whereas the logical device number of Lamb only describes a single device or partition. The set of devices (target) contemplated in the claims is unique for at least the reason that the target can contain partial access to a device or partition.

In Lamb, devices and partitions are not divided; instead it is an all or nothing access to a device or partition. Lamb teaches that partitions can be masked, but again it is an all or nothing partition, the client either has access or does not. In contrast, utilizing the current invention, a target can be created allowing a group of users to access a group of devices wherein the access may be limited to limited portion of a device. To enable a new user to access the same set of

devices, a new use or group would simply be added to the target. This can be contrasted with Lamb, where a system would be required to access the permissions of each device and change the permissions with regard to the new user. Even then, the new user would have full access to the device, instead of a limited portion of a device.

The above distinctions are further clarified in dependent claims 5 and 19, wherein the target is file or portion that represents a portion of the one or more devices. By having a file or partition represent a portion of the devices, the invention allows access to only a specified portion of a device. While Lamb does mention a partition having a Logical Unit Number, the partition of Lamb is a simple partition having an underlying disk file system. The described partition of the current claims, on the other hand, is a particular type of partition with a special function which is used to virtualize a device, and is not the same as a simple disk partition holding a general file system as described in Lamb.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.²

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 21st day of November, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
JOHN C. BACOCK
Registration No. 59,890
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

JCJ:ahy
AHY0000006907V001